

A REPLY TO RAINER SHEA'S NON-POLEMIC POLEMIC AGAINST MAC, AND THE NATIONAL RIGHT FOR SELF-DETERMINATION IN GENERAL

Westerday, we found by sheer luck an article being spread by the young lad who goes by the name 'Rainer Shea', named "The crypto-fascist group that's infiltrating the online communist community"^[1]. Upon some short investigation, by just typing his name in google, we find out that this young lad is indeed named Rainer Shea, and that he is a young student in the College of Redwoods, studying political science. In short, Rainer Shea aside from being a *parasite* like almost the entirety of his Anglo nation, he is also an aspiring intellectual. In short, he will soon be at the service of the imperialist machinery *officially*.

Nonetheless, we do not write this to throw mood at his name, and neither will we follow the example of Shea and just throw mood at him without quoting any actual position of his. No dear reader, we do respect your intelligence, and we consider this method of debating a method unfit for us communists, and for any honest individual to begin with. This method of *intense phrase mongering* can be found today only in the worst intellectuals of liberalistic mindset, whose goal is not to push the people to understand anything, but to deepen the pre-existing cult of liberalism in one way or another.

We should admit to the reader - and Shea - that MAC entertained the idea about a year ago to perhaps write a small polemic on Shea. Not because he is an important person, but because within his lines there existed some interesting phenomena. Back then,

we made a bet and asked ‘*how long* till Shea goes either to MAC’s point of view, or reverts to being a complete tool in the hands of the imperialists?’ I myself remember having a little more hope than the others for Shea, but alas, I was proven completely wrong. The others in the organization were correct, Shea would have no other option that slid to being a full cog of the leftist aristocracy, of the left flank of imperialism.

Nonetheless, Volker already wrote a reply to Shea^[2], which was more specific to what Shea wrote. But I think that it is my duty too to write something on him, going beyond what Shea wrote and finally put an end to this debate outside of MAC about our lines. We reply here to Shea’s non-polemic polemic not because he indeed critiques the lines of MAC as they are -hence why it is a non-polemic polemic -, since at best, he self-asserts that this X or Y line is wrong without explaining why. Besides this, even his assertions of our lines betray a profound ignorance of our lines, and no wonder that he dares to quote not a single work of ours regarding the things he accuses us of. We will take his accusations piece by piece, and see how correct he is, and in the way also explain our position beyond the scope of what Shea wrote.

Marxist Anti Imperialist Collective, a crypto-Strasserite group, has advocated for Socialism with Richard Spencer Characteristics by endorsing the idea of a white state. Big surprise, why should we care so much? Well, this group is using certain tactics to spread its ideas widely.

First of all, Shea either is dishonest (the reader will notice that all his writing are 90% outright lies, and from the rest 10%, 9% are misrepresented things about our lines), or he never bothered to read what we write, or what the people other than us that he mentions write, or both.

First, he says we are 'crypto-strasserists'. We wish to say to the reader this: unlike many other communists, we at MAC, have *never* hidden anything. Not even once. We were always clear, every single time. If we were Strasserists, we would proudly say so. Obviously, we aren't. In fact, people also called us 'Strasserists' some time ago, and Volker wrote the following on it:

Strasserism is a school of Nazism that was promoted by Otto and Gregor Strasser in the 1920s and 30s. It is mostly just National Socialism, but with an emphasized opposition to large-scale capitalism, both finance and industrial capitalism. The Strasserists ultimately advocated a return to economic planning based on medieval trade guilds within a modern context. We do not really have anything in common with Strasserism. Anything we say about finance which happens to be in common with the Strassers is only a credit to them for being right, rather than a detraction to us for being wrong. The entire point of our opposition to finance capitalism is due to the way in which it stifles the development and growth of large-scale industry. We don't care for medieval trade guilds, nor have we ever made such an argument. Again, it is unlikely our detractors even know what Strasserism is.[3]

Volker is clear here, we have no relation to so-called 'Strasserism', and we explain why as a Marxist, mainly speaking about its *economic* programs. Therefore, Shea (and the other liberals like him) who call us this name, either do not know what Strasserism is, or they say the word for 'sound effect', i.e. for *phrase mongering*. We wish to ask the reader, and Shea, if phrase mongering, the usual tactic of liberals and the bourgeoisie, is something fit for communists. Because they will find MAC zero times, *nihil*, resorting to phrase mongering. Therefore, Shea's first accusation fails to describe MAC in any way.

What about his second accusation? That we want socialism with 'Richard Spencer characteristics'? What are the lines of Richard Spencer? Obviously he is a liberal, and thus, regarding economics, there is no comparison of MAC and him. What he is speaking about therefore *are the lines on the national question*. Do we and Spencer have anything in common in this matter? First, we need to present the idea of MAC on the matter before we move to Spencer's. MAC in general, and anyone who has bothered to read *even one* of our announcements regarding national conflicts, support national self-determination of *all nations irrespectively*. We are sure that Shea and his like minded *chauvinists* do not, and we aren't speaking here about the big nations they proudly denounce, like their own, the EuroAnglos. We are speaking here about *smaller* nations too, *oppressed* nations (or if Shea wants to tell us that no nation can be oppressed in socialism, former oppressed nations). We do not need to speculate, we can quote Shea directly denouncing this self-determination of smaller nations. What does Shea have to say about Yugoslavia, the main remaining *prison of nations* in the Balkans by 1990?

The U.S. goal has been to transform the **Yugoslav nation** into a Third-World region, a cluster of weak right- wing principalities with the following characteristics: incapable of charting an independent course of self-development; a shattered economy and natural resources completely accessible to multinational corporate exploitation, including the enormous mineral wealth in Kosovo; an impoverished, but literate and skilled population forced to work at subsistence wages, constituting a cheap labor pool that will help depress wages in western Europe and elsewhere; dismantled petroleum, engineering, mining, fertilizer, and automobile industries, and various light industries, that offer no further competition with existing Western producers.[4]

First thing, Shea claims that Yugoslavia is a nation. Even if one follows the Marxist-Leninist line (and not MAC's line which diverges a little from this), this is obvious 'revisionism', since under the Marxist-Leninist line, *two languages = two nations always*. Yugoslavia had 4 languages, i.e *at least four nations*. Per the Marxist-Leninist line, where culture, collective psychology e.t.c are counted, Bosnians, Montenegrins, and Croats are nations. MAC - or at least me and most members - diverges from this (for me, who i crafted this definition, and which definition most members if not all accept, a nation is a historically constituted community with a common territory, in general common appearance - which is tied to historical constitution- and obviously common language), and *does not* consider the Montenegrins, Croats, and Bosnians as nations, but as part of *one, common nation with the Serbs*. Nonetheless, Shea is against the national-self determination of smaller nations (especially if they are 'white' skinned!), like the Slovenes, Bulgarians and Albanians who composed the non-Serbocroat population of Yugoslavia. Obviously, when one thinks that all people in Yugoslavia compose one nation, one considers the conflicts there as just the US doing stuff, and colonizing the Kosovo mines or something. No mention of Albanians is given on Kosovo, so for Shea it appears that we aren't a nation.

One would ask us, "Should not Communists fight against imperialism? Did not the breakup of Yugoslavia serve imperialist interests" ? Our answer is (more details will be given below) that this was a problem *Yugoslavia itself created*, and this is why MAC supports in principle, the self-determination of all nations. Nonetheless, still, for a Marxist-Leninist, one would oppose the separatist leaders of these nations, but also support the national self-determination and critique the Yugoslav government on this

ground (i.e, what MAC is doing) instead of denying *as a principle* the national self-determination of the small nations, or in case of Shea, outright reject their existence.

But *this is a pattern*. Shea takes the same attitude regarding the Uygurs. Is the CPC genociding the Uygurs? No. We agree this is nothing more than propaganda against the PRC. But does this mean that the Uygur movement is just a CIA backed movement and a creation of the CIA? To claim so, is to not only be anti-marxist in your foundation, but to also be ignorant of the facts. Anti-Marxist because this essentially removes any agency *from the masses of the nation itself*, positioning everything as ‘false consciousness’ or outside meddling (one asks, why are there no separatist movements in DPRK?). It is a completely idealist and quite honestly, *anti-mass* way to view *mass movements*. The masses *have no agency*, the CIA controls them like lifeless objects! This is not Marxism. About the second thing, on facts, Shea ignores the fact that the Uygur separatist struggles have been going on *before* the CPC or PRC ever existed, and before the Americans probably even cared about this small nation. The Uygurs were first liberal-democrats, in the pre-PRC period, then during PRC were communists, backed by the USSR against the CPC, and after USSR fell, there was no backer for them, except the backing of the imperialists and the foreign Islamic donors. This is a fact not even mentioned by Shea. That the Uygur separatists passed from all ‘ideologies’ they could pass, tells us that their movement is not limited to external backing, but it is in fact, *organic*.

What does this principle—unity of the proletariat as the foremost principle—mean for communists on this continent? It doesn’t mean trying to build a “patriotic socialism” or a “socialism with American characteristics,” **because this would harm proletarian unity by going against the right to self-determination of this continent’s colonized**

proletarians. It will also not mean standing idly by while the imperialists and the bourgeoisie use “**self-determination**” as an excuse to foment counterrevolution. In Xinjiang, Hong Kong, Tibet, and Taiwan, the imperialists are seeking the Balkanization of the People’s Republic of China by claiming that these places have a “right” to separate from the authority of the Communist Party. But the Communist Party doesn’t heed these absurd arguments. [5]

In short, reader, Shea supports self-determination of the nations within the US, (then, now he does not), but not also of the oppressed nations of the PRC. It is not US propaganda that the CPC pushes the Mandarin language to be taught in schools in Uyghur regions. The CPC admits it so itself, and one can read their reports on the matter. Not only this, but not recognizing the right of self-determination is by itself sheer chauvinism (Shea later mentions Lenin, but Lenin nonetheless recognized the self-determination of the Finns even if the Finns were anti-communists). Again, it is obvious Shea not only opposes the current main separatist movements, *but the right of the nation itself* to self-determination. He does not even critique the CPC of its Han (and specifically, Mandarin) chauvinist policy. He does not even call for a federation like the one in USSR, he just repeats verbatim the chauvinist lines of CPC. Does it end here? Not at all. The pattern goes on and on, and we arrive in Taiwan. It is clear that Taiwan is *not one nation*, and largely, its majority nation is not even the Mandarin but the Hokkien, followed up by the Hakka and so on. Shea writes this:

Ultimately, Washington aims to apply the Balkanization model to China as well, which it’s manufacturing consent for by claiming Xinjiang needs to be “liberated” from supposed Uyghur oppression, that Tibet needs to be “freed” from Chinese socialism, **and that Taiwan and Hong Kong somehow aren’t Chinese.** [6]

What one understands immediately is this: let's suppose that all Chinese people are one nation. Shea has already broken with Marxism-Leninism on what a nation is when he spoke about Yugoslavia. Let's suppose that the members of the *Sinitic race* (who speak different Sinitic languages, and thus, under even the Marxist-Leninist original definition of the nation, of different Sinitic nations) are one nation. Does not Rayner Shea know that Taiwan *was colonized* by the Sinitics around the same time the Europeans colonized North America? The indigenous nations of Taiwan belong to the Formosan race, a race that within the last 300 years, the Mandarins (and especially the last 100, under the KMT Mandarin chauvinist government), have brought up to extinction.

It seems to me that Shea regards Taiwan as China, and he clearly is not coherent. He cares not about the nations of the world, just the nations inside the US. He is quick to denounce white nationalism because it is built upon stolen land, but when it comes to China, he even refuses to entertain the idea of anti-colonialism in Taiwan. If one would apply Shea's logic in Taiwan, one would end not only supporting Formosan national independence, but even going as far as saying that the current Chinese have no right in Taiwan either, since then it would be 'justifying native erasure and colonialism'. Obviously, Shea or the people like him never go to the extension of their logic, either because they don't want to, or because they psychologically can't. Nonetheless, we wrote about this to make it clear that an abyss separates MAC (the supposed strasserists) from Shea and the thinkers like him. For MAC, *all nations are equal and all deserve the right to self-determination, small or big, new or old*. For Shea, this is *selective*. Some nations do not deserve it, even if they are

likewise colonized. If Shea's line is Marxism, and our line is Strasserism, then we openly say that we are Strasserists and that Marxism is one of the worst expressions of bourgeoisie chauvinism.

Nonetheless, let's move on with Spencer, now that we have established the difference between how MAC views the national question, and how Shea and his co-thinkers (in fact, Shea by his racialism is closer to Spencer than MAC) view it. What are Spencer's lines? We will analyze here three of Spencer's lines on the national question, first, his own nation, the EuroAnglo, then the various white skinned nations of Europe and the Americas, and third, the Jewish question.

Lets see his opinions by quoting Spencer himself:

I also have big dreams. Reviving the Roman Empire would be an empire that would be welcome to Italians, to Scotts, to Russians, to white Americans to Fins, etcetera. To have a safe space for all Europeans from around the world.[7]

We can see here that Spencer is *a rootless cosmopolitan, wanting to unify different white-skinned nations into one nation*. This is completely against what MAC is saying, on all fronts. We have repeatedly stated that we are against this 'europeanism' espoused by these rootless cosmopolitans who proclaim themselves as 'nationalists' of a non existing nation. This is not my opinion, but it is the general opinion of the MAC as a whole. We will quote here announcements and lines adopted by MAC regarding this supra-white (european) state Spencer wants.

We consider this, at its core, a Trotskyist principle, which defies the (what we view as correct) Marxist view of the national question as formulated by Bolshevik leader J. V. Stalin. **We understand that Europe is not one nation.** Thus, on the view of national self-determination, **we don't advocate a United States of Europe, capitalist or socialist.** We oppose the view that this idea should be one of our cardinal principles. On the other hand, we don't oppose this idea in general and in absolute terms if we speak about anti-imperialist or socialist states. While we don't view the idea a cardinal principle, since we consider viewing this idea a Trotskyist and thus incorrect and at times a counter revolutionary view, we don't oppose socialist states in the future voluntarily and by the will of their people uniting into single states or single federations similar to the USSR. It is up to the future socialist nations to decide if they want to be their own state, or if they want to unite with another nation to form multinational states. In this view, holding as a cardinal principle the view of a United States of Europe **means disregarding the line on national self-determination, and we consider this a treason to the proletariat movement,** especially the proletariat movement of the imperialized and oppressed nations.[8]

What is obvious here, is that MAC obviously does not consider all 'white' skinned people one nation, nor does it promote their unification into one state, as Shea accuses us of doing. One would rather wonder, it is a well known fact that MAC is an organization including members from virtually many different nations across the world, of whom, all are to a degree or another, nationalistic. How would we be 'nationalistic' if we supported the unification of our different nations into one state? It is *someone else* in this debate, (and it is not MAC, but Shea) who wishes to create and maintain multinational formations. Someone else seems to be closer to Spencer than us. Therefore, MAC (and not just me) does not consider the white skinned people of the world as one nation. Spencer does. Therefore, we have nothing to do with Spencer. We contrast the rootless cosmopolitan racialism of Spencer with actual nationalism, and we say the following: all European English

speaking people in the world form one single nation. This includes the Anglos in the US, in the UK, in Oceania and in Canada. Let's move on with Spencer's other lines.

In the below it will become evident that Spencer is truly an anti-nationalist politician, and he implicitly admits so.

But mostly, **Euro-Skeptics are nationalists**. The problem with this is that a "Brexit" could become the ultimate safety valve or distraction, the ultimate false start and red herring. A more powerful position would be **to view the European Union as a potential racial empire and in-gathering, and an alternative to NATO and American hegemony. In other words, why not Make Europe Great Again?**^[10]

Do we even need to say more? For Spencer, euro-Skeptics are nationalists, and he opposes them.

In short, Spencer obviously does not consider himself an EuroAnglo, his real nation, but a member of a fake 'white euro nation'. His will to make a 'white ethnostate' is antithetical to what MAC is proposing. Why? Because Spencer views all white people as one nation, and since the EuroAnglos form the majority of this people in North America, he just 'falls in line' with some parts of the MAC line *by accident*. MAC does not say that all white skinned people in North America are one nation. We specify that it is the English speaking ones of them who are one nation. The Cajuns, the Quebecois, the Hispanics e.t.c aren't obviously members of this nation, but members of a separate French and Hispanic nation. Spencer wants to make a White state in America, only to also include all Europeans in it, and then extend it to all of Europe. *We want the opposite*. Therefore, our line is not 'Socialism with Spencer characteristics' but the opposite.

Finally, on the Jews.

I have great admiration for Israel's nation-state law. Jews are, once again, at the vanguard, rethinking politics and sovereignty for the future, showing a path forward for Europeans.[10]

Spencer is a Zionist. He believes that the Jews are a nation, and he supports Israel.

MAC on the other hand, is probably the most vocal anti-Jew Marxist organization outside of Arabia. When we say 'anti-Jew' we don't mean the Nazi type, where the belief that Jews are a nation is ingrained deep within their theories, no. MAC does not believe that the Jews are a nation, *but a cult, a religion*. Thus, they have nothing to do with demanding a state. If the reader does not believe it, we only need to quote some declaration of MAC (we won't even go as deep to quote individual members of our organization):

-On the Jewish question-

SECTION 1: Staying true to the Bolshevik line, we don't consider the Jews a nation. Until recently they did not have a stable territory, nor a single language, nor any connection with each other. Following this same Bolshevik line, we consider the idea that the Jews constitute a nation, Zionism.

SECTION 2: The acceptance of Jewish nationality goes hand in hand with reactionary cosmopolitanism which we oppose. The Jewish identity holds the seeds of Zionism due to the important 'national' aspect of the religion, the idea of the 'chosen people' and the 'holy land'. This means, that the non-Zionist Jew is a Jew on transition; he either becomes a Zionist (understands himself as a member of the Jewish nation, and the idea that Jews are a nation is the essence of Zionism) or abandons his Jewish identity and adopts his actual nation's identity (Arab, German, Russian etc.). Thus, we oppose the Jewish identity as well and we support their assimilation (breaking the validation of the 'ghetto mindset' as Lenin wrote) to their respective nations.

-On the question of Israel -

We consider Israel an illegitimate imperialist colonial project of the Zionists against the Arabs. Israel is the foremost imperialist stronghold in the Levant, sponsoring Levant's worst reactionaries. Our organization opposes the existence of the state of Israel, and considers the land occupied by Israel as land belonging to the state of Palestine.[8]

Therefore, Spencer considers the Jews a nation, MAC does not. That Shea mentions the Jews quite a lot of times in his writings, *but never says that they aren't a nation* (in fact, he mentions that they were previously an 'oppressed people', tells us that *he probably thinks they are a nation*) tells us that the probabilities are high, that like the previous lines, Shea is in fact closer to men like Spencer than MAC would ever be.

But let's move on with Shea's accusations.

They lure normies in, then use their favored members who've been trained in their rhetoric to push their ideas. What are these ideas? They're cloaked in communist language, but they consistently serve to nudge people towards the position of supporting white nationalism. The starting point in this ideological pipeline is that any pluri-national socialist countries are chauvinist.

Shea makes here two accusations: first, that MAC's life mission is to spread "white nationalism" (as we are clear that we don't think all whites as a nation, we will take it that Shea means 'EuroAnglo nationalism') and second, that any multinational formation (including socialist) is chauvinist.

To answer the first, we need to say nothing more than what we already said: we support the self-determination of nations in general, and the Anglo nation is part of this principle. We speak of one of the

biggest nations on the planet, we cannot and could not not speak about it. National self-determination has two sides, one being separation from another state, and the other being the unification of a splintered nation in one state. The EuroAnglo nation is the most splitted nation of its size on the earth. The Mandarins are ready to fight a whole war for an island which is like, 20% Mandarin, and the Russians are already fighting a war for an area which is like not even 5% of their whole nation. Yet, the EuroAnglos are divided in plenty of states, which do not hold 5-10% of the nation, but about half of it. And Shea tells us to not speak of the unification of this nation, to *not* expose the bourgeoisie who have made this nation their whore from the beginning? What is a stronger ideological weapon against the bourgeoisie patriotism that is being spread to the EuroAnglo working classes - a bourgeoified, but still largely a working class which soon will stop being bourgeoified - and masses ? The bourgeoisie have first raped the EuroAnglos with a split, then they rape them again today with their assimilation with other nations (and thus, the destruction of the other assimilated nations too). That Shea opposes us mentioning this about his nation, does not only means that he is a bourgeoisie agent, willingly or unwillingly, but that he is also a hater of his own nation. Someone who hates his nation *can never* lead it to revolution. And this is a historical law of revolutionary development one can confirm by studying the revolutions of the world as they happened and not as if *they* would want them to happen.

As Volker said in his first reply to Shea, MAC was in support of EuroAnglo proletarian nationalism and self-determination before he ever was in the organization, and before the organization held in its ranks any anglo. Back then, the organization was made up from the following nations: Albania, Serb, Hungarian, Greek, Lombard, Arab, French, Russian, and Slovenian. This is the time when the line

originated within the MAC, mostly from my writings (and sure as hell I am not an Anglo), specifically my articles “The US elections” and the “US capitol insurrection”. Shea therefore, is completely dishonest again. One can read our work in the MAC archive, and see that the national question is indeed a central theme, but the question of the EuroAnglos composes a minimal part of our work, especially for its size and therefore, global importance.

This is regarding the first. Now let's move to the second. To do this, we need to finally define what we mean by chauvinism.

In my opinion (which is shared by majority if not all of MAC, and will be formulated in more detail in my notes on the national question), chauvinism is essentially, the wish to promote the strength of one nation in the back of another. Chauvinism has *four expressions*, first is the old ‘genocidal’ chauvinism, mostly abandoned by everyone in our day and age. This chauvinism used to militarily exterminate other nations, either by killing them, expulging them, raping their women and forcefully assimilating their children completely to the new nation, destroying the bond of the family (and hence, the nation), by taking young children from their parents and growing them up as children of the oppressor nations (for example the Ottoman Devshirme), e.t.c e.t.c. This chauvinism was mostly expressed during older times, in the pre-capitalist era, and most importantly, in the era of the transition of capitalism to imperialism, and of countries where pre-capitalist modes of production co-existed with capitalist ones and also tried to transition this peculiar society to imperialism.

In most big nations who practiced this before, this practice has vanished both in practice and ideology. It still exists among small nations, who are especially from different races, mostly ideologically

among politicians and admittedly, to masses, but it fails to take a practical form most of the time. It is almost impossible for this to happen in the era of the city, without mass casualties (and potential extermination during the war through pyrrhic victory) on the oppressor nation too. The oppressor classes and nations used this expression of chauvinism back when they were standing in a mountain which had a clear huge river separating their mountain from the nearby isolated forest, and they were able to send some fire arrows to the isolated forces without much damage to themselves. Now, in the era of the city, this is impossible. The river has dried out, and in its place the trees and flora has grown to where the river was, and there is almost nothing splitting the mountain from the forests. Not only this, but now the ones in the isolated forests have learnt how to fly fire arrows from afar. This is the *material* reason that this expression of chauvinism has stopped, and has indeed taken a place of deep disgust in the minds of most people in developed countries. It is not because our generation is smarter or more 'enlightened' than the previous ones, but because we have internalized since small kids that this could lead to the common destruction of everyone. To anyone who has seen as a kid the Soviet short movie 'Konflikt', it will be easy to understand what I mean as 'internalization'.

There is the second expression of chauvinism, defensive chauvinism. This chauvinism is almost exclusive to members of the oppressed nation (or the nation which thinks it has been oppressed) who have now achieved their freedom. It is usually not organized in a systematic manner, and comes out mostly spontaneously from below and is forced in the 'above'. This chauvinism follows nations since the beginning, and it also follows the different practices of the expressions. Depending on the development of the nation (both material and therefore mental) this chauvinism can take the form of

expulsions, genocides, or simple breaking of relations and prejudice against the other nation. This chauvinism is the one least 'at fault' majority of the times, and the source to combat it lies mostly not internally, but externally, i.e, to the former oppressor nation. First the chauvinism of the oppressor nation should be combated, so the defensive chauvinism dies out slowly once the nation sees that they have nothing to fear anymore. Most times, this chauvinism finds itself in the period of the liberation war to make a state, and the following years. The Greek revolution of 1821 saw such chauvinism against the Turkish oppressor, for example the massacres at the Battle of Navarino or the Siege of Tripolitsa. In our modern period, we can see similar chauvinisms in the post soviet era, for example the Abkhazian expulsion of many Georgians in Abkhazia. There is also the expression of this chauvinism manifested in breaking of relations and prejudice against the former oppressor nation (real or not), such as the Polish and the nations of the Baltics against Russia, or the previous one of Iraq against Iran.

This second expression of chauvinism will form the dominant form of chauvinism in the former oppressed nations who will soon get liberated in the majority of the world. Probably, 90% of the world's nations are still stateless. One can see the future world as multiple Ottoman empires, and see the future as the final century of the Ottoman empire.

The third expression of chauvinism is *cosmopolitanism*, i.e the rejection of nationalism (something which Shea is promoting). In this form of chauvinism, the 'nation' is something that needs to be destroyed. This chauvinism is the best expression of imperialism, and it is during imperialism that it could get a mass base even. *What is not being said* is what nation will be assimilated to which. An Anglo who calls us to abandon nationalism (like Shea), does not tell us this:

to *which nation* we will get assimilated then? Will the Anglos learn Albanian or the Albanian english? Will the Ossetin or Chechen learn Russian or the Russian Ossetin and Chechen? Will the Mongol and Uygur learn Mandarin or the Mandarin Uygur and Mongol? This is not said by the proponents of cosmopolitanism. This cosmopolitanism is essentially chauvinism, even if its proponent is conscious of it or not. The result of this theory is *no different* from the other expressions of chauvinism, and inevitably, one nation will grow in the backs of the other. The reader will notice that if they stay and ponder on this, and ask themselves “From what nations the ones who promote this are from?” They will see that they are mostly from the big nations of the world, whose existence is probably guaranteed in this cosmopolitanism. If this Cosmopolitanism became official policy for a century, these nations would grow and not become smaller. Of course, this is nothing more than the *other side of the coin* of the last and fourth expression of chauvinism, *assimilationism*.

Assimilationist chauvinism is the *default of most communists*, and the proletariat which keeps with it the remnant of the old chauvinism of the bourgeoisie when it does and advances its revolution. In its nature it is bourgeoisie, and in its form it may seem proletariat. This is because it tries to reconcile two opposite things, namely, the *innate* nationalism of the proletariat which exists (and *will keep to exist*) outside of the bourgeoisie, and the inherited chauvinism of the bourgeoisie which places nations *as competitive markets*. Chauvinism in its essence, is *competition*, and assimilationist chauvinism, which is the dominant form of chauvinism in worker states, is precisely the attempt to reconcile these two ‘nationalisms’. People like Shea do not understand that the CPC is a full blown nationalist party, which while it is nationalist inside of it, it is chauvinist against the other nations and seeks to assimilate them. People who say ‘down with

nationalism' but they keep supporting the nationalists and chauvinists of parties like the CPC, they are essentially against the nationalism of some nations and in support of the nationalism of other nations. They should change their motto, so anyone can see them for what they are, to 'Down with X nation, long live Y nation'.

Does it matter if the assimilationist does with X or Y intent in mind? *It does not.* For the assimilated, *the result is the same.* Intellectuals of all calibers can speak about the 'primacy of anti-imperialism' or the 'unity of peoples' or the general progress e.t.c when they discuss national liberation movements, but this is nothing more than a luxury of the person who is not affected negatively by chauvinism. To the one being assimilated, he doesn't care if his enemy is a communist, a liberal, or a fascist. He cares about how assimilation is a direct threat.

We have demonstrated here, that all these four expressions of chauvinism, from the Roman empire massacring whole peoples, to the Anglos in their treatment of the American natives, to the Nazi Germans regarding the Slavs, to the well known to us from the small nations article of Engels "The Magyar struggle", to the CPC and to Lenin saying that some times, the right of Self-determination of small nations should not be supported, from the Cosmopolitan bourgeoisie Masons and Jews like Rockefeller who proudly say that their goal is to integrate the earth into one people, to H. G. Wells saying that everyone needs to throw off the national flags and adopt one cosmopolitan flag, all these people, movements, empires, e.t.c, all, hold *one very basic common element.* Their end result is that one nation inevitably grows in the extermination of the other. These four expressions of chauvinism do not at all differentiate in the result; the result is the death of a X or Y nation and the empowerment of X or Y nation on top of first's carcass. Where they differentiate is *the*

method. Is like the bourgeoisie; they split into parties, which all aim to keep capitalism, and the main difference is the method of management. Nonetheless, these expressions of chauvinism most times aren't isolated from one another, and in real life they oftentimes 'work' side by side.

Now, dear reader, and dear Rainer Shea, do you understand now why MAC thinks as non-desirable multinational states? It does not matter what the intent of the one promoting them is, we know that the result will be chauvinism. And we ask the dear reader (and Shea): is MAC wrong on this empirically? How many multinational formations have history seen where assimilation of the smaller into the bigger, or even the death of both and the spring of a new nation entirely, has not taken place?

Under this mode of thought we say that *indeed*: Any multinational state is by its *essence* chauvinist. Sometimes this is shown explicitly, sometimes implicitly, but what has been proven by history is what we are saying. And history is neither 'communistic' nor 'yoke', neither 'fascistic' or 'liberalistic', history is objective events, else one wishes to see in history an intelligent design by a higher being moving things with an ulterior motive). Poor Shea thinks that MAC needs to study the classics of Marxism Leninism and then, our eyes will be opened and abandon our lines. We need to tell them openly: we have. This is why we hold our lines. We wondered "why did the USSR fall?". The answers of the maoists, of liberals, and even of most communists did not satisfy us. It is obvious their answers have nothing in common with the marxist methodology to analyze history. So we went and studied the primary sources of USSR, PRC, and see what these people who run these states were thinking, what the masses there were thinking, and we reach a conclusion: for communists to demand multinational states as a matter of principle,

is us adopting chauvinism as a *matter of principle*. And what is the result of chauvinism? Defensive chauvinism, and constant conflict between the proletariat of our peoples, and a whole domino of disaster. Not only this, but we also love our nations. We do not view our nations as pawns of the big 'communist' checkerboard, but we really do love them. We wish them to keep existing, without stepping on the neck of others, but to cooperate and work with other nations on an equal foundation. Therefore, we oppose chauvinism not only because it breaks the international proletarian struggle, but because it is also something which wishes to destroy our people whom we love.

The reader will see that MAC's line against multinational formations, is in essence, a line against chauvinism without 'ifs' or 'what's'. One can quote monger Stalin or Lenin or Marx as much as they want, but one cannot change reality. The USSR fell *the way it did* because it could not assimilate the nations of it. From the moment where Stalin said that 'We will never assimilate anyone', and from the moment his faction won, it was a countdown for the USSR. Stalin wanted to reconcile two things which were *impossible* to reconcile. A multinational formation on one hand, which would never have chauvinism on top of it, but rather combat it and win it, and the multinational formation itself being a long term project. The proof for this being an impossible reconciliation? The history of the Soviet Union and eastern Europe itself. The Stalinists said that they will never work to assimilate the nations of the USSR. All good here. But what did the Stalinists do? They started acting 'chauvinistically' within the communist parties. They started killing proletarian leaders of non-russian nations if they expressed some wills of independence, and then they also started killing off leaders of nations outside of the USSR. One can argue that X or Y who was

killed was a fifth columnist, a liberal, e.t.c We think it is impossible that all proletarian leaders were such, and we think that indeed, many of them were killed because they wished to keep a more independent line than Moscow. How correct this is is for anyone to judge, but we know this: Stalin himself said that the communists can't win by giving commandments to other nations or even to the working class which is outside the party, and at the end of the day the party itself. What does it achieve when Moscow kills off party leaders it does not like outside of the Russian nation, or even the USSR, and replaces them with people who tow their line? What will the masses of the other nations think of the Russians and their new leaders even?

We are sure Stalin had no chauvinism in mind, and we are certain because we have readed his writings and we were able to deduct $2+2 = 4$. But, the methods of the Stalinist faction (which was in our opinion, the most revolutionary tendency in USSR in its history) inevitably *harbored* a great evil which Stalin, and his faction, theoretically (and in practice when related to the nations themselves) wanted to destroy. That of chauvinism. Let's see this step by step. Under Stalin, the legitimacy of nations to exist was largely not harmed at all. What was harmed was the legitimacy of this nation to have its own leaders if these leaders went against Moscow. We see some shades of chauvinism here against these proletarian leaders. The reader will ask, 'but this is an attack against the leaders, not the nation'. And we will answer 'who placed these leaders in the leadership of X nation?'

After Stalin, followed Kruschev and Brezniev. Their policy now extended from just finishing off leaders who wanted to be more independent, to dictating terms to non-Soviet nations, and essentially trying to make them Soviet republics without them being

soviet republics. As the Workers Party of Korea said, it was raining in Moscow, and the people of Berlin were the ones to take out their umbrellas. After them came Andropov who said that 'sooner or later, the nations of USSR should soon start abandoning their nation and start uniting into the new, Soviet amalgamation of nations as tovarisch Lenin said. Then came Gorbachev, who openly said that it is time for the USSR to enact this policy right now, and for Russian to become the mother language of all nations in the USSR, like English became for all people in North America. This is no coincidence, and we think this is how every multinational formation will end up, whatever its starting intentions are. One does not even need to mention PRC, they found the 'solution' by doing what Putin said, i.e not even pretend they don't want to assimilate but do it as a policy of the state. Chauvinism in short, is the policy of the Chinese state since 1950. They started out with what Gorbachev had in mind without even passing from the previous stages.

To say it again, our line on this is not without thought. We have a reason that we have it. Let's move on with Shea.

This idea that no nations can even voluntarily share in a singular state alliance, no matter how much autonomy the nations in this alliance have, is used by them to vilify the USSR and the PRC. They claim the DPRK is the only real current socialist country for this reason. If this all-encompassing view of what "chauvinism" means sounds like it's pro-balkanization, that's because this is exactly what they promote as an absolute for the conditions of any region. Even I no longer want to balkanize America, and instead desire a post-colonial federation.

First, if Shea wants to say that by saying the truth we 'vilify' USSR and PRC, then we can say that Shea is not a true communist but a 'diplomat'. He does not care about the truth, but about a specific agenda. We do not consider what we write vilification, else one

considers the critiques of Marx and Engels and Lenin on the Paris Commune vilifications of the first (short lived) proletarian state.

Second, we never said DPRK is the only existing socialist country, what we have said is that DPRK is objectively more socialist than everyone else. Socialism is not a self-assertion, but it is about the economic position of each country. In which country is there more power to the market? Is it Cuba? Is it China? Is it Vietnam? Is it Laos? Is it Korea? MAC answers that quite honestly, it is Korea. One can say with certainty that Korea has built a Socialist society. The others had such a society and now they turn day by day to capitalist society, to the capitalist elements winning over the socialist elements.

It is in this manner that we speak of the DPRK as we speak.

Third, as we said in the first pages, Shea has gone to the 'right' of his original position. From condemning the 'PatSoc' position (i.e, from where he was closer to the MAC, which also was against this PatSoc position) he essentially adopted it. Most PatSocs have no issue with such a federation (after all, the US itself is a federation), they would just adjust the existing borders of the 50 states. Rainer Shea has essentially turned backwards, to chauvinism. What will be this 'new post-colonial federation' in practice, where 80% of it will be the EuroAnglos? At essence, for all important matters, the decision will be decided by then, as it happens in all multinational formations. Or does Rainer Shea want for the minority to rule? It is obvious whatever he wants, this won't happen. What will happen is that the 'republics' in this post-colonial federation will decide most minimal things related to their own, but the AngloWhites by virtue of being the majority. We can even check the 3 most prominent multinational formations (which had some lasting and were not plagued by constant war) where nations outside of the bigger one had some kind

of rights. Let's see the first USSR. In both three higher organs of the USSR, the majority nation, the Russians, ended up dominating it, and thus deciding the higher policy of the minority nations.

The first organ was the Congress of the Soviets, which lasted from 1922 to 1936. In this congress, there was one delegate for every city council (25,000 voters) and one delegate for every 125,000 for the autonomous areas e.t.c. What does this mean in practice? It means that the majority of the delegates in the Congress of Soviets would obviously be the Russians, since they formed the nations with the most residents. Even if there were no city councils, and it was one delegate for every 125,000 residents for everyone, then again, the weight would fall to the Russians. Let's suppose that All non-Russian delegates opposed something, and that only the Russians voted in favor of it, it would still pass despite what the others would vote for. Essentially, by default of the system, the delegates of the other nations could only function as 'balancers' of the factions within the Russian delegates. They would be unable to form a truly equal or independent policy for their nation. They would only rely on the Russian delegates.

After this, came the system of the Supreme Soviet. This is the system adopted after the Stalin constitution, and is far better for the nations outside the Russian we need to admit. But still, while the power of the Russians diminishes, it still largely relies on them. This Soviet was composed by two Soviets, the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of nationalities. The Soviet of the Union was composed of one delegate per 300,000 people. There was no difference between nations, and if a nation had 3 million people, it would have 10 delegates, and if one had 300,000 only one delegate. In essence, this Soviet was no different from the previous one. What makes this development a better thing for the non-russian nations, is the Soviet of the

nationalities, which was composed with the same delegates for every republic. The Russians here were equal to everyone else. But what we need to understand, is that again, for all big decisions, i.e voting for the presidium, there needed the joint votes of the two soviets. In short, in the previous system (we will take here as base year 1989, and remove city councils which would have benefited the Russians more, since most big city councils were in Soviet territory), the Russians would have 1160 delegates, and all the rest 1120. If we take an individual nation, like the Uzbeks, they would have 128 delegates. The entirety of the 128 delegates of the Uzbeks could go against an important decision, and it still would not matter. The entirety of the non-Russians in the USSR could take a position, and if the Russians hold the same position, it would still not matter.

In the Stalin system with the Supreme Soviet, the Russian would have $483 + 32$ delegates, i.e 515. The Uzbek would have $53 + 32 = 85$ delegates. I.e, the Russian saw an increase (with the soviet of nationalities) of only 6.2% in its delegates, and the Uzbek 37%. With the previous system, there would be 128 delegates for the Uzbek and 1160 for the Russian, i.e, the Russian would have about 10 delegates for each Uzbek one. In the new system, the Russias had for every Uzbek 7 delegates. The Russians were still stronger than the Uzbek, but still, it was a great improvement. For even a smaller nation (with a republic) like the Estonians, in the Soviet of the Union they would have 3 delegates, and with the Soviet of the nationalities they would get another 32, i.e it would get about 900% more delegates. In the previous system, the Russian as we said would have 1160, and the Estonian 6. I.e, for every Estonian there would be 193 Russian deleages. In the new system, for every Estonian, there were 14 Russians.

Before we unneededly drag it, we can see that the new system was a huge improvement for non-Russians, and a step towards more equality within USSR, but still, this equality was based on the 'inequality' of the Russians in USSR, who were majority of USSR, but did not have the majority of the delegates. And is the nature of every multinational formation, that any bigger equality for a minority nation, there is even greater inequality for a majority nation. For how long will the bigger nation accept this? We do not think that even here, such a system is viable in the long term.

The next system was the Congress of people's deputies, which did not last long enough for us to produce much data, since the USSR ended up falling nonetheless.

We see the progress of the system in the USSR. The good things that happened after the Stalin constitution apparently ended up the Russians feeling underrepresented, and pushing for assimilation. While the Russians were the bigger minority of delegates, they weren't the absolute majority, and they were always at threat of the other nations banding together and legally pushing it to obscurity. A system cannot be considered fair when the majority can be pushed back by the majority. We think that such a system does not have a healthy foundation. But this is the farthest a multinational formation can go, and still it does not solve the contradictions at all of multinational federations, it just breeds 'conspiracional' and 'diplomatic' politics for supremacy. The Russian will always feel threatened by the non-Russian, and thus he will always be wary of how while being the majority, he has the minority of delegates. It is again a problem that will end up either in assimilation, or separation, and in the USSR, it ended up in the second.

Let's see Yugoslavia. In Yugoslavia, we had two chambers, the Federal chamber and the chamber of republics and provinces. Essentially, combined, the republics would have 42 delegates, and the autonomous provinces would have 32. The Serbs (if we do not count all Serbo-croats into them) formed 35% of the population (about 8 millions) and had 42 delegates. The Slovenes, who had one million, had the same delegates. The Bulgars, who had the same number, also had 42 delegates. The Albanians, who also had one million, had only 32. The Albanians had the same population with the Bulgars and the Slovenes, but fewer delegates. The Serbs had 7 times more the population of the Slovenes, but had the same amount. For every Serb delegate, there were 7 Bulgars, and 7 Slovenians. For every Albanian delegate, there were about 10 Bulgars and 10 Slovene delegates. This system could not last by any means of the world. Nonetheless, the reality is that the Serbocroat nation holds the biggest power combined (as to why this nation decided to fight each other is another discussion) with a combined 188 delegates, with the other nations having a combined of 148 delegates. One would say, 'all good'. But the thing is that this was not even the real number, since most delegates of Vojvodina weren't Hungarians who were the minority of the province, but Serbs. Thus, in reality the Serbocroat delegates were far more. Obviously, still the Albanians had more delegates than their population. Not only this, but the fact that they had no republic could only make the situation worse for all the Yugoslav state. The nations of the republic ended up fighting one another for the same reasons as the USSR. We can see that even here, this could not work.

We won't even need to go to PRC, there are no republics for nationalities, and the autonomous regions hold more Mandarins than the other nations. It is obvious here that there is no opposition to the Han and neither can be any such opposition by legal means.

The non-Han nations have two options: follow legal means, which do not give them any control of their nation's life whatsoever, or fight illegally (which is what they do).

Nonetheless, we end up that there can be no multinational formations not ending up dominated by chauvinism. In USSR and Yugoslavia, when this happened, the multinational formation came to an end, and in China, they started as chauvinists from the start. So what exactly is Rainer Shea telling us about the USA? He wishes to turn it to a 'post-colonial federation' (at least he is not so chauvinist as to tell us he won't even make one federation, but make a unitary state like the one of PRC). What he does not understand is that again, the EuroAnglos will end up dominating it. He can only do one thing so the EuroAnglos won't be dominating: have only a Soviet of nationalities *without* a Soviet of the union. I.e, have the minority of 30% rule the majority of 70%. The EuroAnglos will have, lets say, 30 delegates, and the AfroAngos, the Hispanics, the various natives, the Cajuns, will have (let's suppose here that all natives are one nation and have therefore one republic) a combined of 120 delegates.

As if any nation in the world (and here we speak about the former oppressor, who will not accept this ever out of pride) would accept to be the majority of a state and be ruled by the minority, and call this Socialism! Either this, or again, the non EuroAnglos will be completely under the control of the EuroAnglo.

In short, Rainer Shea is closer to being a 'racist' than we are; we do not wish for the AfroAnglos, the Hispanics, the Native nations, the Cajuns, e.t.c, to be ruled by the EuroAnglo. We say openly: we do not desire this, and we desire these nations to be independent. None will control the EuroAnglo other than the EuroAnglo, and none will control the AfroAnglo other than the AfroAnglo.

If Rainer Shea does not like this idea we are presenting here, he should come openly and say why. Either the “whites” will rule the “blacks” or the opposite. We proved above by talking about the federational systems of the USSR and Yugoslavia why it is impossible for it to be not the one or the other.

If Shea wants the first (to rule over the AfroAngos) he needs to come openly and say it: I am a white Supremacist!

If Shea wants the second he needs to come and say it openly: I am a cuckold. A black supremacist without being a black! What percentage of the militant proletariat of the EuroAnglos will accept it? Only the *serviles* who are incapable of revolution.

This is also another reason we are against multinational federations. It is only possible to be *really equal* under proletarian democracy, where one person = one vote, if all nations in it have the same number of people. We all know that this is in real life almost (if not completely) impossible. Even if it was possible, if there are let's say, 3 nations, who tells us that there won't be a conspiracy to fight off and split the third nation for these two? These things have happened in history, and in socialist nations too, and they will keep happening as long as this is even legally applicable in the context of the said formation.

We arrive therefore, that a multinational federation to be really equal needs to have two nations with an equal amount of numbers of people. But even here, this presupposes that this number won't change. What if the territory of one nation is able to hold 3 times the number it already holds? Should they not do this, out of concern of keeping equality? Is not this forcing essentially inequality to the one nation by forcing equality when the chances of population development aren't equal?

Therefore, we can have a truly equal federation only if both have the same amount of people and the same ability to their territory to have the same maximum extension of the population. I.e things which are impossible to happen in real life dear reader.

This is another reason why MAC in general opposes multinational formations, or at least opposes them as a matter of them being necessary. Let's move on with Shea's writing.

This obsession with promoting balkanization naturally feeds into an imperialism-compatible view of Yugoslavia and the balkan region's current hostilities, which I've also seen promoted by ultras. But these people are worse than ultras. Racism is at their ideology's core. When you accept their idea about nationalism being necessarily front and center to communism, you can come to other imperialism-compatible conclusions, like that Ukraine's regime isn't actually fascist but merely concerned with "the nation." They argue this, by the way.

Here Shea speaks again about Yugoslavia and the Balkans. As we said, someone who thinks that Yugoslavia is one nation has no right to speak about the Balkans at all, and we explained why. Nonetheless, Shea by saying the 'imperialist view of Yugoslavia' he probably means that the war in Yugoslavia was orchestrated by the imperialists, ignoring that the imperialists started openly playing an active role only when it became apparent that Yugoslavia was going down due to its own *internal contradictions*, mostly national, and thus they wanted to make the best for them. Nonetheless, an important part of this 'imperialist narrative' consists of three things: first, keeping the Dayton agreement alive, second keeping the Kumanovo agreement alive, and third, keeping the Ohrid agreement alive. These agreements are all based of course on keeping nations splitted and fake statelets existing, something which MAC absolutely opposes.

First, MAC opposes the Dayton agreement, which is the first act of the 'imperialist narrative'. A necessary prelude for this agreement is that Bosnians and Croats form separate nations than the Serbs, hence they deserve self-determination. Not only this, but their Self-Determination is based upon the non-self determination of the Serbs (in this frame of view, the Serbs being separate) since it includes Republika Serbska within the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Therefore, even if we take the 'imperialist narrative' as true, i.e, where Bosnians and Croats are separate nations than the Serb, still, the Dayton agreement is based on the Serbs lacking self-determination, i.e, it is based on the fundamental splitting of the Serbian nation in more than one state. I guess Shea would call us 'balkanizers' for wishing that at least Republika Serbska should unite itself with Serbia at least. Let's move to the second step of the imperialist narrative, the Kumanovo agreement. This agreement is based on the prerequisite of denying the self-determination of both Serbs and Albanians, since according to the constitution of Kosovo (which is an 'offspring' of this agreement), Kosovo can never separate itself or join a third state, i.e, a partition of Kosovo among national lines, the Albanian part to Albania and the Serb to Serbia can never happen without breaking the constitutional framework, i.e doing some sort of revolution or coup de dat. Not only this, but since Kosovo is under the jurisdiction of the UN, NATO e.t.c, this means that for the Albanians to unify most of Kosovo with the homeland, we would need to fight the entire world. Back then we had to fight only the Serb, now we need to fight the entire globe! Great work brethren, keep thinking the Americans saved you! Therefore, it is obvious MAC is against this openly. The third part of this 'narrative' is finally, the Ohrid agreement, which is there to secure the existence of Macedonia as a state, and keep the Bulgarians and the Albanians separated from their motherland, forced into an artificial

construction. Obviously, MAC opposes this too, and supports the Self-determination of the nations of the Macedonian state, something which the Ohrid agreement prohibits. Nonetheless, it is proven here Shea does not know what he talks about, since all parts of the imperialist narrative he speaks about are opposed by MAC, but probably are supported than him. I bet he opposes the self-determination of nations, as proven (except perhaps the Serbs, and ever here accidentally, because he wants Yugoslavia back, so he will accidentally unify all Serbs in one state again) before in his stance on the national question in general, and therefore he is practically in favor of at least two of the three agreement's essence, (Kumanovo and Ohrid) which have as the main point the blockade of the self-determination of the Albanians and the Bulgarians. No part therefore of the imperialist narrative is supported by MAC. We could even say that the basis of the imperialist narrative is even something which (as we said before) *was the fault of Yugoslavia*. No borders were *really altered* by the imperialists, in fact, the imperialist agreements were made there to keep the borders of Yugoslavia's republics and provinces intact. In short, in case Yugoslavia had adopted the Soviet system, there would be no war, and all existing republics would secede without much fanfare (as it was proven, the masses of these states wished to secede themselves). Again, even here, the legal problems which resulted in the Army being forced to dispatch itself to fight the separationists, and thus, resulted in the start of the war, were to be found in the article 5 of the 1974 constitution, where unilateral secession was practically legally impossible. We can see here that only people who think that the world starts in 1991 (probably like Shea) can speak about 'imperialist narratives'. The imperialist narratives themselves build upon the Yugoslavian mistakes in them wishing to form their state on the basis of a bourgeoisie state formed through plunder and war, something

the Bolsheviks warned the Serb communists to not try to do since the 1920s. And it is Shea who wishes to keep creating ground for imperialist meddling, by wishing to keep frontiers of states as they are inherited by the multinational bourgeoisie states, which were formed precisely by this plunder and war, full of internal contradictions. Then Shea speaks about 'racism' being core to MAC. For one to be a Racist, they first need to subscribe to racialist ideology. In what terms does Shea think of 'race'? He probably thinks of color, so he is the 'racialist'. MAC on the other hand, speaks of nations, and for 'race', it considers close nations (i.e, linguistic families, Slavs, Germanics, e.t.c). Nonetheless, it is not MAC speaking on racialist terms, this is his favorite CPC. MAC peaks always on national terms, never saying 'we support the self-determination of the Race'. So again, Shea does not know what he talks about. He speaks about 'nationalism' being the 'core' of our theory. It is part of our theory, and MAC has acknowledged that every single time there is a *successful* communist movement, there is *nationalism behind it*. As we said above, Shea just supports some nationalisms and he opposes some nationalisms. If he wished to oppose nationalism, he would also need to oppose every single communist government, including the workers party of Korea which said explicitly that they are nationalists. But first and foremost, he should also oppose the CPC, his beloved vanguard party of the world. Since nationalism is always a central theme of successful communist movements, to not support it is to say that we do not want to build successful communist movements. We are not Anarchists, neither liberals, nor Utopians. If Shea thinks he can defy history, he is free to fail and fade to obscurity like thousands before him. Long last, he says we support Ukraine. Shea should do good and read our lines on the question. MAC, before even the war started, supported Russia, and since

almost two years ago also supported Luhansk and Donetsk in a declaration.

Let's quote some official MAC declarations on the question (and not at all personal opinions of our writers).

-On The Republic of Crimea-

We support the Republic of Crimea as a republic of the Russian Federation. Under our general line in regards to the national question, the Republic of Crimea fits all three criteria. First, anti-imperialism by siding with Russia and therefore with the Anti-imperialist camp (for example, most if not all anti-imperialist states in the world supported the Republic of Crimea, such as Venezuela, Cuba, DPRK e.t.c) against the fascists-imperialists and their compradors in Ukraine, and second nationally speaking. The majority of Crimea was populated by Russians, and still is to this day. The third criteria is also present, since the population of Crimea voted overwhelmingly in favor of seceding from Ukraine and joining the Russian Federation in 2014. During a referendum of March 16 2014, with a turnout of 83%, 96% of the people who voted voted in favor of entering Crimea as a federal republic in the Russian federation.

-On the Luhansk people's republic-

We support the Luhansk People's Republic. Under our general line in regards to the national question, the Luhansk People's Republic fits all three criteria. First, anti-imperialism by siding with Russia and therefore with the Anti-imperialist camp against the fascists-imperialists and their compradors in Ukraine, and second nationally speaking. The majority of Luhansk People's Republic was populated by Russians, and still is to this day. The third criteria is also present, since the population of Luhansk People's Republic voted overwhelmingly in favor of seceding from Ukraine forming an independent state in 2014. During a referendum of May 11 2014, with a turnout of 75%, 96% of the people who voted voted in favor of separation.

-On Donetsk people's republic-

We support the Donetsk People's Republic. Under our general line in regards to the national question Donetsk People's Republic fits all three criteria. First, anti-imperialism by siding with Russia and therefore with the Anti-imperialist camp against the fascists-imperialists and their compradors in Ukraine, and second nationally speaking. The majority of Donetsk People's Republic was populated by Russians, and still is to this day. The third criteria is also present, since the population of Donetsk People's Republic voted overwhelmingly in favor of seceding from Ukraine forming an independent state in 2014. During a referendum of May 11 2014, with a turnout of 74%, 89% of the people who voted voted in favor of separation.[8]

Now, what MAC has been arguing is the question: Is Ukraine a nation indeed, or it is part of the Russian nation? This amounts to 'Is Ukrainian the same language as Russian?'. MAC has not come to a conclusion yet, and we have thus played it safe, saying that all Russian majority areas of Ukraine (where there is no debate if they are Russians or not) should unify with Russia. Again, the reader can see that Shea is a sheer liar. In all of his work so far, he has said not even one single truth.

But let's move with Shea's claims.

The logical conclusion of their ideas is that whites need to form their own state in America for the sake of combating U.S. imperialism, and that white nationalism can't be fascist because it supposedly stands in utter opposition to the imperialist state (i.e. ZOG rebranded). In reality, white nationalism has only two potential roles, neither of which are anti-imperialist. One is to serve as a rival imperialist force to the current settler state, seeking to break from the U.S. so that whites can occupy Native lands with less restrictions on their ability to carry out racial terror. The other is to serve as a proxy for the existing settler imperialist state, carrying out terrorism against Blacks, Natives, Brown people, and communists. As in the people who the state seeks to continue repressing.

Here we can see Shea in full light. He misunderstood not only the arguments of MAC, but also the situation of his own society. No wonder why communists have always been a failure in the US, this is what happens when you start with a fundamental wrong premise of the basis of your society.

First, Shea does not speak of “fascism” in marxist terms. ‘Fascism’ is nothing more than the various superstructures of imperialism, and currently the US is already fascist. Volker in his own reply already spoke on this, that even if the White nationalists are also ‘imperialist’, then this tells us that their struggle against the ruling imperialists is still progressive for us, since it opens us more opportunities. This is the essence of why MAC even supports this ‘multipolar’ world order spoken by Russia and China. We have *no illusions* that the Russian bourgeoisie currently in government or the Chinese bourgeoisie currently in alliance with the workers, will just see the fall of western imperialism and stay with their hands locked. They will seek to *replenish* the imperialist void. The result of this would be the transition from one big imperialist center currently existing in the world, to multiple imperialist centers. This competition between multiple imperialist centers, naturally makes imperialism less efficient, less efficient in parasitizing entire populations, and therefore the labor aristocracy which is currently the majority of imperialist nations will shrink in all nations. Not only this, but the multiple imperialist centers will seek to centralize the imperialist centers into one once again, and therefore a struggle will ensue among them, which will leave enough room for us to maneuver more easily. All in all, everything is positive if instead of one imperialist center, there are two, three, e.t.c.

As Stalin said, the slogan “Asia for Asians” is supported by the bolsheviks as long as it stands against Western imperialism, but is

opposed by the bolsheviks as long as it is also a call for eastern (i.e Japanese at the time) imperialism.

Therefore, even if Shea is right, the development of this white nationalist movement is still positive for us. On the other things he speaks, he is obviously wrong simply by the evidence of what happens in the US. Nonetheless, in the next and last passage is where things get more interesting (we will ignore the passage before the last, since Shea is just showing his idiocy and fear of MAC - he fears the truth - and our writings openly):

Indigenous erasure is ironically part of their agenda as well, despite them claiming to care so much about national self-determination. Their idea that whites need to form a state on this continent implies the settler-colonial occupation should continue. It also deliberately ignores the nature and reality of colonization, acting as if whites were an equivalent social category to Blacks under our current conditions. Under settler-colonialism, whites are the colonizers, and don't require "self-determination" because they already have disproportionate power as is. Communists must unequivocally reject white nationalism, and not enable those who seek to normalize it within communist spaces.

As expected, Shea again speaks sheer lies. Just to shut up his mouth once and for all, I will quote writings from the two MAC members who have written mostly regarding the national question in the US, namely me and Volker, to prove that 'indigenous erasure' is not something MAC has anything to do with. It is, after all, Shea who denies the self-determination of the native nations in the US, as proved by his 'post colonial federation' line.

The white nationalists (and the vaguely nationalist-minded), and **hopefully the black, Chicano, or various natives** will take up arms seriously, and there will be a long insurgency. [11]

In short, we always supported the self-determination of the native nations, and not only that, but I think that 'hopefully' will take up arms against the American fascist state and fight a long insurgency against it.

Next, is Volker.

What do we celebrate, in toasting the “American nation”? **We celebrate the financier state, which keeps the White, Black, Cherokee, Apache, Cajun, Chicano, etc. people in the pocket of global finance capital**, which offers them peace and bread at home for war and famine abroad. Whatever semblance of revolutionary spirit there existed in the “American nation” upon its founding, in the 18th century, is long gone. The United States has far surpassed the British crown of old in the art of despoiling.[12]

The Indians, lastly, cannot really be expected to learn English at all, unless one is to expend a huge amount on their schooling. What similarities exist between a language that calls a boat a “boat”, and a language that calls a boat a “ᑲᑭᑦᑲᑦ”? Thus, the majority of them were not given schooling, but death. The adoption of English, as already stated, only occurred in exceptional circumstances. **Today still, the Native Americans are deprived of proper education in their native languages, their reservations are left impoverished, and they are forced to remain in this condition or abandon their nations to partake in the Anglo-American system.**^[13]

Consequently, the simple reply from the White working class is: we will give the Black Belt to the Blacks, **the Indigenous lands to the Indigenous peoples**, and keep the land we and our ancestors have been on for centuries. That will be the end – we will leave you alone, and you will leave us alone. That is the content of the so-feared, so-dreaded “White Nationalism”. [14]

As proven by the main writers of MAC on the question, MAC always affirmed its support to the native nations of the US. We aren't Shea, where self-determination of nations is selective. All nations are equal, or they aren't. All have the right to self-determination, or they

don't. Shea sits in the camp which says 'some have the right, some have it not'. He reminds us of the usual way liberals paint Lenin, with Lenin supposedly saying 'we are all equal, but some are more equal than others'. MAC on the other hand, openly proclaims the right of self-determination of all nations, big and small, old and new, period. Just like the EuroAnglo wishes to keep existing as a nation, without his national rights infringed, just like this, the same wants the AfroAnglo, the Native american, the Hakka, the Chechen, the Serb, the Albanian, the Somali, and all nations of the world. MAC says it openly: all nations are equally equal, and none is more equal than the other. Shea and his ilk think the opposite, else they would support in principle the self determination of nations which live in states they like.

Then, he speaks about 'settler colonial occupation if we make a white state'. This proves how he is insulting our intelligence in our faces. The *EuroAnglo Shea* virtue signals us that he is the self-sacrificing hero, and we want to 'justify' this settler colonial occupation. We already spoke about why his plan is openly EuroAnglo chauvinist, even if he tries to paint this chauvinism as 'internationalism' or 'the whites losing power', we proved that in his own formations, the whites will pretty much keep power.

Whatever Shea does, the 'White' (EuroAnglo) will keep existing in America, both in his system, and in ours. The difference is that in his system, the EuroAnglo will keep dominating, like it or not, the other nations, since he forms the biggest majority. In our system, the 'White' won't be able to dominate anyone besides his own nation, since the places where are populated by other nations will be carved out of his state. The result is that a 'White' state will keep existing either way. In Shea's state he will assimilate all others and thus, his state will finally eradicate all minorities, (The 'white' Shea so much

'despises' will grow in the back of others), in our plan, the 'White' will not grow in the back of others. We ask the honest reader, who is the true 'chauvinist', Shea or MAC?

This, or Shea wants to eradicate all 'White' people and have their territory be re-settled by the native Americans. If he wishes this, not only he is a zionist idiot, a despicable person, but he is also an utopian, since this can never happen practically. We speak of about one million native americans against 350 million non natives (the hispanics and AfroAnglos or the french are also non-native). If Shea thinks that in this confrontation the natives can win, he is an utopian of the worst caliber. If Shea wants to carve some small territories currently populated by non-natives around the areas the native nations live, with the non-natives then subsidized to immigrate in their core territories, as a gesture of good will, then yes, we agree with this settlement. After all, not all territorial gains of the non-natives are historically constituted. If this is what Shea is saying, we agree. If he is saying that he wants to genocide (or have the natives rule the non-natives) the he should said it openly, and he should also proclaim support for zionism, becuae it also uses the same arguments.

This is dear reader the actual positions of MAC. We see that Shea is a liar, and a crypto-chauvinist. Nonetheless, we do not await a response by Shea. Shea has in fact posted his articles in our spaces for the past three years, yet, when he writes a polemic to us, he dares not to post it in our spaces, because he is afraid we will see it and we would write a response. Shea plays the brave man behind doors, hoping the one he insults will not notice him. We will send him this article, and we hope he responds to both mine, and Volker's reply.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Rainer Shea, August 7, "The crypto-fascist group that's infiltrating the online communist community", Rainer's newsletter
- [2] J. Volker, August 9 2022, "Rainer Shea", MAC
- [3] J. Volker, June 14 2022, "Our Ideology", MAC
- [4] Rainer Shea, January 20 2022, "Neoliberal misery and its destabilizing consequences 2022", Rainer's newsletter
- [5] Rainer Shea, February 19 2022, "What will anti-colonial socialist revolution look like?", Rainer's newsletter
- [6] Rainer Shea, January 6 2022, "India's service to US empire brings its balkanization closer", Rainer's newsletter
- [7] Ashley May, October 17 2017, "Richard Spencer speaks at University of Florida today. Who is he?", The USA today
- [8] MAC, February 4 2021, "Lines and elections within MAC", MAC
- [9] Richard Spencer, May 25 2016, "Euro-Skepticism" skepticism
- [10] David Brennan, July 23 2018, "White supremacist Richard Spencer is a fan of Israele's nation-state law", Newsweek
- [11] F. U. Kuqe, January 16 2021, "The US capitol insurrection", MAC archives
- [12] J. Volker, July 4, 2021, "For the 4th of July", MAC archive
- [13] J. Volker, July 8, 2021, "The birth of America: a review and analysis of Settlers by J. Sakai", MAC archive
- [14] J. Volker, October 1, 2021, "Patriotic socialism or anti-settler socialism", MAC archive

F. U. Kuqe 18/8/2022



Opinions stated should be taken as those of the author and not the organization unless stated otherwise.